REMARKS

Claims 1 to 74 have been cancelled. Claims 75 and 77 have been amended. New claims 78 to 97 have been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

With regard to claim 75 the inventor has recognised that in a system according to the invention comprising a tag and a tag receiver, for alerting a user having the tag receiver to separation from a tagged object, the tag comprising a spread spectrum transmitter, the transmitter may be configured to transmit a spread spectrum signal consisting essentially of a spreading code unmodulated by baseband data. This in turn facilitates the construction of a low-cost, low-power consumption tag and receiver system.

The accepted wisdom in the art by contrast teaches the use of modulation. This can be seen from the cited prior art documents – all of these teach the use of modulation. For example Yarnell teaches the use of NRZ modulation (col 7 lines 34-36) to modulate a personal identification code or PIN (col 7 line 5) onto the spread spectrum signal. More generally Yarnell explicitly teaches modulation throughout (see under the Summary of the Invention at columns 3 and 4, in the Overview at col 6 line 51 onwards, and at col 11 line 56-57).

Eagelson implies data modulation (see, for example col 12 lines 17-32) and does not mention spread spectrum. Nadel teaches modulation (see, for example, figure accompanying the Abstract, which shows a Data Source, Data Sink and Demod 915). Issacman teaches modulation (col 5 line 24), Rosenthal teaches Frequency Modulation, FM (see, for example, col 3 line 39), and Welch teaches the use of a PIN (col 3 line 54) and does not mention spread spectrum.

It is further submitted that the skilled person would have no incentive to modify the teachings of Yarnell as there is no indication in the prior art of a problem with modulation. However even were this considered there would be no expectation of

success. This is because an attempt to use a spread spectrum signal consisting essentially of a spreading code unmodulated by baseband data in the system of Yarnell would cause the system to become inoperable because modulation is essential to the Yarnell system (see Overview at col 6 line 51 onwards) – for example it would not be possible to transmit the preamble security word (col 6 lines 66-67; col7 lines 37-48). Furthermore if, say, the skilled person wanted to produce low-cost, low-power consumption system there would be the alternative of the Nadel system (see Abstract re low cost, low power advantages), which teaches the provision of time reference correction information to the signal processing components of the receiver (Abstract).

It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 75 is allowable.

With regard to claims 76 to 88, the Applicant has amended claim 75 upon which these claims are ultimately dependent. As shown above amended claim 75 should now be allowable over the prior art, and therefore dependent claims 76 to 91 are allowable for the same reasons.

With regard to claim 88, this includes a corresponding limitation to claim 76 (to which it refers) and it is therefore submitted that this is allowable for corresponding reasons to those given above in respect of claim 76.

With regard to claims 89 and 90, it is respectfully submitted that these are allowable because they are dependent upon allowable base claim 88.

With regard to claim 91, this includes a corresponding limitation to claim 76 (to which it refers) and it is therefore submitted that this is allowable for corresponding reasons to those given above in respect of claim 76.

With regard to claims 92 and 93, it is respectfully submitted that these are allowable because they are ultimately dependent upon allowable base claim 91.

With regard to claim 94 there is nothing in any of the cited prior art documents to teach or suggest a system for alerting a user having a tag receiver to separation from a tagged object, the system comprising a tag and a tag receiver, the tag comprising a spread

spectrum transmitter, and wherein the spread spectrum signal is based on a Gold code. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 94 is allowable.

With regard to claim 95 there is nothing in any of the cited prior art documents to teach or suggest a system for alerting a user having a tag receiver to separation from a tagged object, the system comprising a tag and a tag receiver, the tag comprising a spread spectrum transmitter, and wherein the spread spectrum signal is based on a Kasami code. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 95 is allowable.

With regard to claim 96 there is nothing in any of the cited prior art documents to teach or suggest a tag for a system for alerting a user having a tag receiver to separation from a tagged object, the system comprising a tag and a tag receiver, the tag comprising a spread spectrum transmitter, and wherein the spread spectrum signal is based on a Gold or Kasami code. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 96 is allowable.

With regard to claim 97 there is nothing in any of the cited prior art documents to teach or suggest a receive for a system for alerting a user having a tag receiver to separation from a tagged object, the system comprising a tag and a tag receiver, the receiver comprising a receiver front end to receive an spread spectrum signal from the tag; a detector, coupled to said receiver front end to detect a reduction in the strength of a signal received from the tag; and a device, coupled to the detector, to provide a user alert when a reduction in signal strength is detected; and wherein the receiver is configured to receive a spread spectrum signal which comprises a spreading code based upon at least one of a Gold code and a Kasami code. It is therefore respectfully submitted that claim 97 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons the Applicant submits that the objections to the pending claims have been overcome and that the claims are allowable. The Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner allow claims 75 to 97. If any extensions of time are necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, the Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions.

Respectfully submitted,

P. J. Mart.

Dr Philip J. Martin

Date: March 21, 2005